



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/052,250	01/23/2002	Russell T. Davis	7643.0042	1920
22852	7590	08/23/2005	EXAMINER	
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP 901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413			NGUYEN, CHAU T	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
				2176

DATE MAILED: 08/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/052,250	DAVIS ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Chau Nguyen	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 June 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-64 is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-64 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
      1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
      3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 06/13/2005.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Amendment, received on 06/13/2005, has been entered. Claims 1-64 are presented for examination.

***Information Disclosure Statement***

2. The information disclosure statements filed on 06/13/2005 have been recorded. However, the information disclosure statements have not been made available to the Examiner, therefore the information referred to therein has not been considered.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-2, 5-7, 11-18, 21-22, 24-31, 34-35, 37-43, 46-47, 49-55, and 59-63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saxton, US Patent No.

6,370,549 and further in view of Polizzi et al. (Polizzi), US Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0052954.

5. As to claims 1, 17, 29, 30, 42, 54, and 62, Saxton discloses a data processing system for developing reports, comprising:

a parser that receives one or more text documents and creates software elements having a format with a hierachal relationship between the software elements based on the one or more text documents (Abstract, col. 5, lines 63 – col. 6, lines 16); and

However, Saxton does not explicitly disclose an editor that develops a report by referencing the software elements created from the one or more text documents to form a structure of the report and retrieves data from one or more sources to represent one or more values within the report. Polizzi discloses in Abstract, page 3, paragraph [0024] and page 6, paragraph [0039]: a repository stores all computer files, which are called objects, and the objects can be any computer file such as text documents; these text documents are organized or arranged in a hierarchy). Polizzi also discloses preparing a report based upon retrieved data (Abstract). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Polizzi and Saxton to include develops reports by referencing the software elements created from the one or more text documents and retrieves data from one or more sources to represent one or more values within the report in order to allow user to view and select reports.

6. As to claims 2, 18, 31, 43, 55 and 63, Saxton and Polizzi (Saxton-Polizzi) disclose wherein the format with the hierachal relationship between the software elements is a Numerator Document Object Model (NDOM) (Saxton, Abstract).

7. As to claim 5, Saxton-Polizzi disclose wherein a manager manipulates the software elements (Saxton, col. 5, line 63 – col. 6, line 65).

8. As to claims 6, 21, 34, and 46, Saxton-Polizzi disclose wherein the manager manipulates the software elements by browsing, editing, loading, and storing the software elements (Saxton, col. 6, line 66 – col. 7, line 11; Pólizzi, Abstract, and page 1, paragraphs [0005]-[0006]).

9. As to claims 7, 22, 35, and 47, Saxton-Polizzi disclose wherein a mapper generates a relationship between the data from the one or more sources and the one or more values to be placed within the report (Polizzi, Abstract, page 3, paragraph [0024] and page 6, paragraph [0039]: a repository stores all computer files, which are called objects, and the objects can be any computer file such as text documents; these text documents are organized or arranged in a hierarchy). Polizzi also discloses preparing a report based upon retrieved data (Abstract). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Polizzi and Saxton to include develops reports by referencing the software elements

created from the one or more text documents and retrieves data from one or more sources to represent one or more values within the report in order to allow user to view and select reports).

10. As to claim 11, Saxton-Polizzi wherein a mapper links the report and the one or more sources that will present one or more values within the report (Polizzi, Abstract, pages 3-4, paragraphs [0024]-[0026], and page 6, paragraph [0039]: a repository stores all computer files, which are called objects, and the objects can be any computer file such as text documents; these text documents are organized or arranged in a hierarchy). Polizzi also discloses preparing a report based upon retrieved data (Abstract). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Polizzi and Saxton to include develops reports by referencing the software elements created from the one or more text documents and retrieves data from one or more sources to represent one or more values within the report in order to allow user to view and select reports).

11. As to claims 12, 24, 37 and 49, Saxton-Polizzi disclose wherein the report and the one or more sources are linked through a "drag and drop" process (Saxton, col. 1, line 61 – col. 2, line 12 and col. 7, lines 12-24).

12. As to claims 13, 25, 38, 50, and 59, Saxton-Polizzi disclose wherein the editor provides for the software elements to be modified to create a new combination of

software elements representative of a new text document (Polizzi discloses object or category within the repository is modified (page 4, paragraph [0027]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Polizzi and Saxton to include modified object or category in order to provide a copy of the output report as an automatic update to a user's page).

13. As to claims 14, 26, 39, 51, and 60, Saxton-Polizzi disclose wherein the editor provides for modification of one or more parameters associated with the software elements (Polizzi discloses object or category within the repository is modified (page 4, paragraph [0027])). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Polizzi and Saxton to include modified object or category in order to provide a copy of the output report as an automatic update to a user's page).

14. As to claims 15, 27, 40, 52 and 61, Saxton-Polizzi disclose wherein the software elements are transformed to new software elements and are imported into an RDL system (Polizzi, Abstract, page 2, paragraphs [0008] and [0020]: the portal page is an object arranged in a format that is readable by a browser program, and the user interface may be based upon a standard browser program that is capable of reading HTML, Java, XML, or other languages. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Polizzi and Saxton to include using a standardized browser program as a user interface so the

user can point and click on hypertext links to navigate through the portal system which provides the ability to search both structured and unstructured data).

15. As to claims 16, 28, 41, and 53, Saxton-Polizzi disclose wherein the software elements are transformed to the new software elements by retrieving a tag associated with each of the software elements in a dictionary and invoking a translation routine associated with the tag (Saxton, col. 7, line 44 – col. 10, line 30).

16. Claims 3-4, 19-20, 32-33, 44-45, 56-57, and 64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saxton, and Polizzi et al. (Polizzi) as applied to claims 1-2, 5-7, 11-18, 21-22, 24-31, 34-35, 37-43, 46-47, 49-55, and 59-63 above, and further in view of Hamscher et al. (Hamscher), published by July 31, 2000.

17. As to claims 3, 19, 32, 44, 56 and 64, Saxton-Polizzi, however, do not disclose wherein the one or more text documents are XBRL documents. Hamscher discloses XBRL consists of a core language of XML elements and attributes used in document instances as well as a language used to define new elements and taxonomies of elements referred to in document instances (pages 1-3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Hamscher and Saxton-Polizzi to include XBRL documents because XBRL documents allow software vendors, programmers and end users who adopt it as a

specification to enhance the creation, exchange, and comparison of business reporting information.

18. As to claims 4, 20, 33, 45, and 57, Saxton-Polizzi-Hamscher disclose wherein the parser creates the software elements having the format with the hierachal relationship by interpreting tags included in the one or more text documents (Hamscher, pages 1-3 and 7: Hamscher discloses XBRL consists of a core language of XML elements and attributes used in document instances as well as a language used to define new elements and taxonomies of elements referred to in document instances (pages 1-3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Hamscher and Saxton-Polizzi to include XBRL documents because XBRL documents allow software vendors, programmers and end users who adopt it as a specification to enhance the creation, exchange, and comparison of business reporting information).

19. Claims 8-10, 23, 36, 48, and 58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saxton, and Polizzi et al. (Polizzi) as applied to claims 1-2, 5-7, 11-18, 21-22, 24-31, 34-35, 37-43, 46-47, 49-55, and 59-63 above, and further in view of Clancey et al. (Clancey), US Patent No. 6,134,563.

20. As to claim 8, Saxton-Polizzi, however, do not explicitly disclose wherein one or more templates are used to develop the report. Clancey discloses a user can create

and edit a report, which is created based upon a predefined template (col. 24, lines 5-30). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Clancey and Saxton-Polizzi to include using templates to develop the report. By using templates to develop reports, it would provide user-friendly environment and save time for users.

21. As to claims 9, 23, 36, and 58, Saxton-Polizzi and Clancey (Saxton-Polizzi-Clancey) disclose wherein the one or more templates contain data that is directly inserted into the report and instructions enabling data from the one or more sources to be inserted into the report (Clancey discloses a user can create and edit a report, which is created based upon a predefined template (col. 24, lines 5-30). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Clancey and Saxton-Polizzi to include using templates to develop the report. By using templates to develop reports, it would provide user-friendly environment and save time for users).

22. As to claims 10 and 48, Saxton-Polizzi-Clancey disclose wherein the one or more templates provide instructions to a mapper to retrieve the data that is directly inserted into the report and data from local or remote sources (Clancey discloses a user can create and edit a report, which is created based upon a predefined template (col. 24, lines 5-30). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Clancey and Saxton-Polizzi to include

using templates to develop the report. By using templates to develop reports, it would provide user-friendly environment and save time for users).

### ***Response to Arguments***

In the remarks, Applicant(s) argued in substance that

A. The prior art, taken alone or in combination, fails to teach "an editor that develops a report by referencing the software elements created from the one or more text document to form a structure of the report".

In response to argument A, Polizzi discloses object includes HTML and SQL files are stored in a repository and arranged in a hierarchy or a tree system (software elements), and processing jobs that can retrieve data within a portal system (include repository) to generates reports (page 3, paragraphs [0024]-[0025]).

B. The prior art, taken alone or in combination, fails to teach a parser that receives one or more text documents, interprets tags included in the one or more text documents to create software elements, and determines the hierarchy of the software elements within a structure representative of the one or more text documents.

In response to argument B, Saxon discloses files (documents) and directories are maintained in a structured hierarchy (software elements) (col. 6, lines 6-16), and the content of the files contains tags that permit the file location to contain other information pertaining to each component file in the record (col. 8, lines 48-64).

C. Hamscher or Clancey reference fails to teach or suggest "an editor that develops a report by referencing the software elements created from the one or more text documents to form a structure of the report".

In response to point C, Examiner did not use Hamscher or Clancey reference to reject this limitation. Instead, Examiner's used Polizzi reference to make the rejection which is already discussed in argument A.

23. Applicant's arguments filed 06/13/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Please see the response to arguments and the rejection above.

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chau Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-4092. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am – 5:30 pm Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached on (571) 272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306. On July 15, 2005, the Central Facsimile (FAX) Number will change from 703-872-9306 to 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Chau Nguyen  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 2176

*William F. Bashore*  
WILLIAM BASHORE  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
8/22/2005